



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,712	07/25/2003	Teruo Maeda	116672	1898
25944 7590 04/10/2007 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER PHAM, HAI CHI	
			ART UNIT 2861	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/626,712	MAEDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hai C. Pham	2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C. Pham. (3) _____

(2) Kevin K. Jones, Attorney. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 02 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tomita (JP 6-67102), Miura (JP 2003-22542).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



HAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

(1) Discuss the claim rejection under 112, second paragraph. Applicant's Representative proposes to amend claim 1 to delete the controversial subject matter with respect to the semiconductor laser being exposed to the outside from claim 1 and to add a new claim (#23) to repeat the above-mentioned limitation with a proper claim language. Claim 5 will also be amended to overcome the rejection under 112, second paragraph.

(2) Applicant's Representative points out that Tomita teaches a semiconductor laser being immobilized by press-fitting into the lens barrel and therefore Tomita would not need the elastic member for further retaining the laser as taught by the secondary reference in Miura. The examiner indicates that the press-fitted semiconductor laser would not be secured/immobilized by itself since the semiconductor laser and the holder would expand differently under the eventual heat generated by the laser during the printing operation. An elastic retainer would be necessary. The examiner indicates that If Miura does not explicitly suggest the necessity of providing the elastic retainer due to temperature change, the examiner will provide other source for such teaching.

HCP
April 2, 2007